arXiv:1610.08884v1 [cs.DM] 27 Oct 2016

Recognizing IC-Planar and NIC-Planar Graphs *

Franz J. Brandenburg

University of Passau, 94030 Passau, Germany
brandenb@fim.uni-passau.de

Abstract. We prove that triangulated IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs can be recognized in cubic time. A graph is 1-planar if it can be drawn in the plane with at most one crossing per edge. A drawing is IC-planar if, in addition, each vertex is incident to at most one crossing edge and NIC-planar if two pairs of crossing edges share at most one vertex. In a triangulated drawing each face is a triangle. In consequence, planar-maximal and maximal IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs can be recognized in $O(n^5)$ time and maximum and optimal ones in $O(n^3)$ time. In contrast, recognizing 3-connected IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs is NP-complete, even if the graphs are given with a rotation system which describes the cyclic ordering of the edges at each vertex. Our results complement similar ones for 1-planar graphs.

1 Introduction

Graphs are commonly drawn in the plane so that the vertices are mapped to distinct points and the edges to Jordan curves connecting the endpoints. A drawing is used to visualize structural relationships that are modeled by vertices and edges and thereby make them easier comprehensible to a human user. Specifications of nice drawings of graphs and algorithms for their constructions are the topic of Graph Drawing [19, 26, 35].

There are several classes of graphs that are defined by specific restrictions of edge crossings in graph drawings. Edge crossings are negatively correlated to nice, and therefore, they should be avoided or controlled in some way. The planar graphs are the best known and most prominent example. Planarity excludes crossings and is one of the most basic and influential concepts in Graph Theory. Many properties of planar graphs have been explored, including duality, minors, and drawings [20], as well as linear-time algorithms for the recognition and the construction of straight-line grid drawings [23,33]. However, graphs from applications in engineering, social science, and life science are generally not planar. This observation has motivated approaches towards *beyond-planar* graphs, which allow crossings of edges with restrictions. A prominent example is 1-planar graphs, which were introduced by Ringel [32] in an approach to color a planar graph and its dual simultaneously. A graph is *1-planar* if it can be drawn in the plane so that each edge is crossed at most once. 1-planar graphs have found

* Supported by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG), grant Br835/18-1.

recent interest as emphasized by Liotta's survey [31]. A 1-planar graph of size n has at most $4n-8$ edges [32] and K_6 is the maximum complete 1-planar graph. 1-planar graphs do not admit straight-line drawings [36], whereas 3-connected 1-planar graphs can be drawn straight-line on a grid of quadratic size with the exception of a single edge in the outer face [1]. Moreover, 1-planar graphs do not admit right angle crossing drawings [21], and conversely, there are right angle crossing (RAC) graphs that are not 1-planar. In other words, the classes of 1-planar and RAC graphs are incomparable. The recognition problem of 1-planar graphs is NP-complete [24, 27]. It remains NP-complete, even for graphs of bounded bandwidth, pathwidth, or treewidth [6], if an edge is added to a planar graph [15], and if the graphs are 3-connected and are given with a rotation system which describes the cyclic ordering of the neighbors at each vertex [4]. On the other hand, 1-planar graphs can be recognized in cubic time if they are triangulated [18] and even in linear time if they are optimal and have $4n-8$ edges [11].

1-planar graphs can also be defined in terms of maps [16–18, 37]. Maps generalize the concept of planar duality. A *map* M is a partition of the sphere into finitely many regions. Each region is homeomorphic to a closed disk and the interior of two regions is disjoint. Some regions are labeled as *countries* and the remaining regions are lakes or *holes*. In the plane, we use the region of one country as outer face, which is unbounded and encloses all other regions. An *adjacency* is defined by a touching of countries. There is a *strong* adjacency between two countries if their boundaries intersect in a segment and a *weak* adjacency if the boundaries intersect only in a point. There is a k-point if k countries meet at a point. A map M defines a graph G so that the countries of M are in one-to-one correspondence with the vertices of G and there is an edge $\{u, v\}$ if and only if the countries of u and v are adjacent. Then G is called a *map graph* and M is the map of G. Note that holes are discarded for the definition of map graphs. Obviously, a k-point induces K_k as a subgraph. If no more than k countries meet at a point, then M is a k-map and G is a *k-map graph*. If there are no holes then M is hole-free. A graph is a *hole-free 4-map graph* if it is the map graph of a hole-free 4-map [16–18].

Chen et al [17, 18] stated that the triangulated 1-planar graphs are exactly the 3-connected hole-free 4-map graphs. Their fundamental result is a cubic-time recognition algorithm for 3-connected hole-free 4-map graphs. They also observed that the recognition problem of hole-free 4-map graphs can be reduced in linear time to the special case of 3-connected graphs. Hence, the recognition problem of 1-planar graphs is solvable in cubic time if the graphs are triangulated. We extend the algorithm to triangulated 1-planar graphs with (near) independent crossings.

A graph is IC-planar (independent crossing planar) [2, 13, 28, 38] if it has a 1-planar drawing in which each vertex is incident to at most one crossing edge and is NIC-planar (near independent crossing planar) [5, 39] if two pairs of crossing edges share at most one vertex. If each pair of crossing edges is augmented to the complete graph K_4, which is drawn as a kite as in Fig. 1(b),

then a 1-planar drawing is IC-planar if each vertex is part of at most one kite and it is NIC-planar if each edge is part of at most one kite. It is known that IC-planar graphs have at most $13/4\,n - 6$ edges [28] and are 5-colorable [38]. The recognition problem is NP-hard, even for 3-connected graphs with a given rotation system [13]. IC-planar graphs admit straight-line drawings on a grid of quadratic size and right angle crossing drawings, which, however, may need exponential area [13]. Hence, every IC-planar graph is a RAC graph. NIC-planar graphs have at most $18/5\,(n-2)$ edges [5, 39] and an NP-complete recognition problem. They admit straight-line drawings, but not necessarily with right angle crossings. In fact, there are NIC-planar graphs that are not RAC graphs, and vice-versa [5]. Hence, the classes of NIC-planar graphs and of RAC graphs are incomparable. Outer 1-planar graphs are another important subclass of 1-planar graphs that admit a 1-planar drawing with all vertices in the outer face [22]. Outer 1-planar graphs are planar [3] and can be recognized in linear time [3, 25].

A drawn graph defines an embedding which is an equivalence class of drawings and consists of faces whose boundary consists of edges or half-edges between a vertex and a crossing point of two edges. There are several ways to augment 1-planar embeddings and graphs. Ringel [32] observed that each pair of crossing edges of a 1-planar embedding can be augmented to a complete graph K_4 that is embedded as a kite. This fact has been rediscovered in many works. A 1-planar embedding of a graph G is *plane-maximal* if no planar edge can be added to G without violating 1-planarity or introducing multiple edges. However, the introduction of multiple edges may be useful at a separation pair. If there are two vertices s and t so that $G - \{s, t\}$ decomposes into components $H_1, \ldots, H_r$, then the augmented components $H_i + \{s, t\}$ are treated separately for a recognition [18] or a drawing [9]. Altogether, there are $r - 1$ copies of the edge between the separation pair $\{s, t\}$. An embedding is *triangulated* if each face is a triangle and is bounded by three (half-)edges (between a vertex and a crossing point). Clearly, a 1-planar embedding without separation pairs is triangulated if and only if it is plane-maximal. If multiple edges are added at a separation pair as described above, then triangulated and plane-maximal coincide on 1-planar embeddings.

A 1-planar graph G is triangulated (plane-maximal) if it admits a triangulated (plane-maximal) 1-planar embedding. It is *planar-maximal* if no edge e can be added to G so that $G + e$ admits a 1-planar embedding in which e is planar. Finally, G is *maximal* if $G + e$ is not 1-planar, *maximum* or *densest* if $G + e$ violates the upper bound of the number of edges of 1-planar graphs and *optimal* if the number of edges exactly meets the upper bound of $4n - 8$. Hence, a graph in a graph class $\mathcal{G}$ is maximal if there is no supergraph in $\mathcal{G}$ with the same set of vertices and a proper superset of edges, and maximum if there is no graph in $\mathcal{G}$ of the same size and with more edges. Similar notions apply to planar, IC-planar, and NIC-planar graphs. Clearly, these concepts coincide for planar graphs whereas they differ for IC-planar, NIC-planar and 1-planar graphs. First, note the difference between plane-maximal and planar-maximal graphs. As an example, remove an edge from the complete graph on five vertices and consider

$K_5 - e$ which is a maximal planar graph. Every planar embedding of $K_5 - e$ is plane-maximal 1-planar. However, the removed edge e can be added and drawn planar if a K_4 subgraph of $K_5 - e$ is drawn with a pair of crossing edges. Hence, $K_5 - e$ is plane-maximal 1-planar and not planar-maximal 1-planar. Similarly, every triangulated planar graph of size at least five is plane-maximal and not planar-maximal (or maximal) 1-planar. Bodendiek et al. [7] showed that densest 1-planar graphs have $4n - 8$ edges and that such graphs, called optimal, exist for $n = 8$ and all $n \geq 10$ [8]. The upper bound was rediscovered in many works. Bodendiek et al. also observed that there are maximal 1-planar graphs that are not optimal. The gap in the number of edges of maximal 1-planar is quite large, as shown by Brandenburg et al. [14], who found sparse maximal 1-planar graphs with $45/17\,n - 84/17$ edges. Similarly, there are sparse maximal IC-planar graphs with $3n - 5$ edges and sparse maximal NIC-planar graphs with $16/5\,(n-2)$ edges, and both bounds are tight [5]. There are optimal IC-planar graphs only for $n = 4k$ and optimal NIC-planar graphs only for $n = 5t + 2$ and such graphs exist for all $k \geq 2$ [38] and all $t \geq 2$ [5]. Maximum IC-planar graphs with $\lfloor 13/4\,n - 6 \rfloor$ edges exist for all $n \geq 5$ and there are maximum NIC-planar graphs with $\lfloor 18/5(n-2) \rfloor$ edges for $n = 5t + i$ and $i = 2, 3$ [5]. Hence, the sequence of restrictions from triangulated to optimal is proper for 1-planar, IC-planar, and NIC-planar graphs.

Finally, note that triangulated IC-planar (NIC-planar) embeddings do not admit separation pairs so that the embeddings are in normal form with a kite at each pair of crossing edges [1] and planar triangles for the other faces. There is a planar generalized dual graph if each kite (and also each planar tetrahedron) is represented by a special node [5].

In this work we extend the cubic-time algorithm of Chen et al. [18] for the recognition of triangulated 1-planar graphs to triangulated IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs. We call the algorithms $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$, respectively. Our algorithms are presented as a program and consist of three parts. They compute an edge coloring and a boolean formula which is used to test IC- and NIC-planarity.

The paper is organized as follows. Section 2 describes basic definitions. In Section 3 we present our algorithm and we show how to solve IC- and NIC-planarity in Section 4. We conclude in Section 5 with some open problems.

2 Preliminaries

We consider undirected graphs $G = (V, E)$ and assume that the graphs are simple and 2-connected, unless otherwise stated. The subgraph induced by a subset U of vertices is denoted by $G[U]$. For convenience, we omit braces and write $G[u_1, \ldots, u_r]$ if $U = \{u_1, \ldots, u_r\}$. The subgraph of G induced by the vertices of subgraphs H and K is denoted by $H + K$, and similarly for $G - H$, except if H is an edge, which is removed from $G - H$ whereas the endvertices remain.

A *drawing* of G maps the vertices to distinct points in the plane and each edge $\{u, v\}$ to a Jordan arc connecting the points of u and v. Two edges *cross* if

their Jordan arcs intersect. A planar drawing excludes edge crossings and a 1-planar drawing admits at most one crossing per edge. A crossings subdivides an edge into two *half-edges*. An *embedding* $\mathcal{E}(G)$ is an equivalence class of drawings and specifies edge crossings and faces. The planarization of an embedding $\mathcal{E}(G)$ is an embedded planar graph which is obtained by taking each crossing point as a new vertex and half-edges as new edges.

A planar embedding partitions the plane (or the sphere) into *faces* or *regions*, called a map [17, 18]. Two faces are *adjacent* if their boundaries intersect. The intersection is a segment or just a common point. A *hole-free map graph* is defined by a one-to-one correspondence between faces and vertices and between adjacencies and edges. There is a k-map graph if at most k regions meet at a point of a map.

(a) (b)

Fig. 1. Drawings of K_4 (a) planar as a tetrahedron and (b) with a crossing as a kite.

The complete graph on four vertices K_4 plays a crucial role in 1-planar, IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs. It admits two embeddings [29], as a *tetrahedron* or as a *kite* with a pair of crossing edges, see Fig. 1. The embedding as a tetrahedron is not necessarily planar. A planar edge can be *covered* by a kite so that an edge is a crossing edge of a kite, see Figs. 5(a) and 5(b). The cubic-time recognition algorithm for hole-free 4-map graphs of Chen et al. [18] searches all K_4 subgraphs κ of the given graph and checks whether κ must be embedded as a kite or as a tetrahedron. This can be determined to a large extend, but it is not unique, as a K_5 illustrates. The complete graph K_5 has five embeddings (up to graph automorphism) [29] as displayed in Fig. 2, but only one of them is 1-planar. If the outer face is fixed, then there are three 1-planar embeddings with one of the outer edges in a kite, see Fig. 3.

3 Recognition

For the recognition of triangulated IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs we extend algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ of Chen et al. [18]. Recall that the 3-connected hole-free 4-map graphs are exactly the triangulated 1-planar graphs. Our algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ extends $\mathcal{A}$ by an edge coloring and a boolean formula. Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ marks an edge if it is planar at the actual stage of the algorithm. A marked edge could have



Fig. 2. All non-isomorphic embeddings of K_5



Fig. 3. Three embeddings of K_5 with a fixed outer face. Each kite includes the edge between the inner vertices and one of the outer edges.

been crossed at an earlier stage, in which case it is crossed in the computed 1-planar embedding. This divergence is due to the fact that algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ removes one crossing edge if it detects a pair of crossing edges. The remaining crossed edge is marked and is treated as planar. Our edge coloring records each decision and tells whether an edge is planar or crossed in every triangulated 1-planar embedding, or whether this is uncertain and depends on a particular embedding. The uncertainty is expressed by a boolean formula such that there is a one-to-one correspondence between feasible embeddings and truth assignments. An embedding is feasible if it is triangulated and IC- and NIC-planar, respectively. We prove the following result:

Theorem 1. *There is a cubic-time algorithm that checks whether a graph G is a triangulated 1-planar graph. It returns an edge coloring of G, from which one obtains a partial embedding of a spanning subgraph of G, and a boolean formula η such that the IC-extension (NIC-extension) η^+ of η is satisfiable if and only if the embedding of G is IC-planar (NIC-planar). Otherwise, the algorithm returns* false *and stops with a failure.*

Algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ is the program of algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ of [18] with a minor simplification. Algorithms $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$ specialize $\mathcal{B}$ to IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs, respectively. They stop immediately if there is a violation of IC- or NIC-planarity. In each step the algorithms add a clause to a CNF formula η. The boolean formulas for IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs have the same structure, however, the boolean variables and the evaluation are different. A boolean variable is associated with a vertex for IC-planar graphs and with an edge for NIC-planar graphs. For every K_4 subgraph κ of the input graph G, the clause $\alpha(\kappa) =$

$(a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa \wedge c_\kappa \wedge d_\kappa)$ expresses that κ is embedded as a kite with a pair of crossing edges and the boolean variable x_κ is assigned the value true. Here, $x \in \{a, b, c, d\}$ is a vertex of κ in the IC-planar case, and x is a planar edge of κ in the NIC-planar case. Feasibility is granted by IC- and NIC-extensions of the form $(\neg x_\kappa \vee \neg x_{\kappa'})$ for every vertex (edge) x and kites κ and κ' that may include x.

Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ systematically checks all K_4 subgraphs κ of the given input graph G. It checks gadgets in a fixed order and tries to determine whether κ must be embedded as a kite or as a tetrahedron, and so do algorithms $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$. In most cases there is an unambiguous decision. However, a separating edge only tells that there is a kite, but it does not fix its position. Another ambiguity comes from small graphs which result from a partition by a separating 3-cycle or 4-cycle. Input graphs of size at most eight are checked by inspection. For example, the complete graph K_5 with a fixed outer face has three embeddings with kites κ_1, κ_2, and κ_3, as illustrated in Fig. 3, and the clause $\alpha(\kappa_1) \vee \alpha(\kappa_2) \vee \alpha(\kappa_3)$ expresses the three options. For an efficient evaluation the clause is simplified.

The specialization concerns the steps of $\mathcal{A}$ with a separating triangle, MC_5 and MC_4. These gadgets are described below. A vertex is incident to two kites at a separating triangle, which violates IC-planarity. The MC_5 step searches K_5 and is vacuous, even for 1-planar graphs, as proved in Lemma 2, and most subcases of the MC_4 step violate IC- and NIC-planarity. Then algorithms $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$ return false and stop. In addition, the set of all IC-planar (NIC-planar) embeddings of graphs of size at most eight is computed and expressed by a simplified boolean formula with variables for the vertices or edges of the outer face.

Next, we explain the edge coloring and the boolean formula.

Definition 1. *An edge of a 1-planar graph G is colored* black *if it is a planar edge in every triangulated 1-planar embedding $\mathcal{E}(G)$. Two edges e and f are colored* red *and* blue*, respectively, if e and f cross in every triangulated 1-planar embedding. In edge is colored* orange *if it is crossed and the candidates for a crossing are colored* cyan*. Finally,* grey *edges are unclear.*

For an uncolored edge $\{a, b\}$ let $\mathcal{C}[a, b]$ be the set of uncolored edges $\{x, y\}$ so that the induced subgraph $G[a, b, x, y]$ is a K_4. Such edges are called crossable edges *in* [18].

The black, red, blue, and orange edges are decided, whereas a cyan and a grey edge may be planar in one 1-planar embedding and crossed in another. Grey edges appear only in small subgraphs, such as K_5 in Fig. 3. A partial coloring χ on a subset of edges of G is extended step by step such that some uncolored edges are colored. Here, blue and cyan overrule black or grey and blue and cyan edges keep their color. There is an error, otherwise, e.g., if a black edge shall be colored blue or red.

Definition 2. *A* coloring *γ of a set of edges $F \subseteq E$ extends a partial edge coloring χ of G if colored edges keep their color and an uncolored edge $e \in F$ takes the color of γ. If γ and χ disagree, then $\gamma(e)$ = "black" or "grey" and $\chi(e)$*

= "blue" or "cyan". Otherwise, there is a conflict between γ and χ, which is reported as a failure.

The boolean formula η is build up step by step as a conjunction of clauses during a run of our algorithms. For every K_4 subgraph $\kappa = G[a, b, c, d]$, which may be embedded as a kite, let $\alpha(\kappa) = (x^1_\kappa \wedge x^2_\kappa \wedge x^3_\kappa \wedge x^4_\kappa)$. In case of IC-planarity, $x^1, \ldots, x^4$ are the vertices of κ, and they are the planar edges of κ in case of NIC-planarity. Each vertex (edge) may be part of at most one kite such that each variable x_κ is true for at most one kite κ. This is expressed by the IC- and NIC-extension, respectively.

Let's recall algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ on triangulated 1-planar graphs which are 3-connected hole-free map graphs. For the formal properties of each step, its computation, and the correctness proof we refer to [18]. Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ "makes progress" (i) by a separation and (ii) by a crossing removal.

There are separating 3-cycles and separating 4-cycles in G. Each such cycle C partitions $G - C$ into an inner and an outer component G_{in} and G_{out}. At the time of the separation, the edges of C are planar and the subgraphs $G_{in} + C$ and $G_{out} + C$ can be treated separately [18]. If C is a 4-cycle, then a chord f must be added to the subgraphs for a triangulation, and f must be chosen properly, such that it is new for the remaining subgraph. The chord is removed if the subgraphs are merged later on. Some edges of C were kite-covered before and were crossed by other edges that were removed in an earlier step of the algorithm. Then some edges of C are colored blue or cyan, whereas $\mathcal{A}$ treats them as black edges.

Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ recursively searches for gadgets, namely, separating 3-cycles, separating edges, separating 4-cycles, separating triples, separating quadruples, separating triangles, MC_5 and MC_4, in this order. The gadgets are described below. Hence, if $\mathcal{A}$ considers a separating edge, then there are no separating 3-cycles and the graph under consideration is 4-connected. There is neither of the other gadgets if MC_4 is applied. The search for the gadgets in the given order simplifies the case analysis and implies that decisions hold for all triangulated 1-planar embeddings.

In each case, algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ finds edges that are crossed in a 1-planar embedding or finds edges that can be treated as planar at this stage. One edge from a pair of crossing edges is removed to make progress towards planarity. If $\mathcal{A}$ does not fail, then it terminates at a triangulated planar graph or at a small graph of size at most eight.

The decisions of $\mathcal{A}$ do not uniquely determine a 1-planar embedding. For example, if there is a separating edge e, then e has the choice among several crossable edges. The case resembles a graph decomposition at a separation pair. Also, K_5 has three embeddings if there is a planar outer 3-cycle. A final ambiguity comes from each pair of crossing edges where $\mathcal{A}$ removes one of them to make progress. The choice has an effect on the ongoing computation process. One may aim at using separating 3- and 4-cycles in the next step by removing the edges of $\mathcal{C}[a, b]$ whereas the removal of $\{a, b\}$ aims at 4-connected planar graphs.

The choice does not affect the "yes" or "no" decision on a triangulated 1-planar graph.

IC- and NIC-planarity need more information on all 1-planar embeddings of the given graph which is provided by an edge coloring and a boolean formula.

Definition 3. *Let G be a 4-connected graph.*

1. *A* separating edge *is an uncolored edge $\{a, b\}$ such that $G - \{a, b\} - \mathcal{C}[a, b]$ is disconnected, see Fig. 4.*
2. *A* separating 4-cycle *$C = (a, b, c, d)$ is a 4-cycle such that $G - C$ is disconnected.*
3. *A* separating triple *is a 3-cycle $C = (a, b, c)$ such that $G - C - \mathcal{C}[a, b]$ is disconnected, see Fig. 5(a).*
4. *A* separating quadruple *$C = (a, b, c, d)$ is a 4-cycle such that $G - C - \mathcal{C}[a, b]$ is disconnected.*
5. *A* separating triangle *is a 3-cycle $C = (a, b, c)$ such that $G - C - \mathcal{C}[a, b] - \mathcal{C}[b, c]$ is disconnected, see Fig. 5(b).*



Fig. 4. A separating edge $\{a, b\}$; the shaded areas represent 4-connected subgraphs. The orange edge $\{a, b\}$ must cross one of the cyan ones.

(a) (b)

Fig. 5. A separating triple with a kite-covered edge $\{a, b\}$ and a separating triangle with two kite-covered edges. The dots represent a subgraph.

We use the following properties of algorithm $\mathcal{A}$.

Lemma 1. *Let G be a triangulated 1-planar graph with $|G| > 8$.*

1. *The edges of separating 3-cycles and 4-cycles are planar at the time of their detection.*
2. *If $\{a,b\}$ is a separating edge, then $\{a,b\}$ is crossed in every 1-planar embedding and the edges $\{a,x\}$ and $\{b,x\}$ are planar for each vertex x with a crossable edge $\{x,y\} \in \mathcal{C}[a,b]$.*
3. *Edge $\{a,b\}$ of a separating triple (quadruple) is crossed in every 1-planar embedding, and similarly edges $\{a,b\}$ and $\{b,c\}$ of a separating triangle.*
4. *If $\{u,v\}$ is a crossable edge of a separating triple, separating quadruple, and separating triangle with edge $\{a,b\}$, respectively, then $\{u,v\}$ is crossed in every 1-planar embedding whereas the edges $\{a,u\},\{a,v\},\{b,u\},\{b,v\}$ are planar in every 1-planar embedding.*

Proof. Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ partitions G into an inner and an outer component at a separating 3- or 4-cycle C and marks the edges of C (Lemma 3.5 of [18]). A marked edge is treated as planar and is not considered for separating edges, triples, quadruples, or triangles. Accordingly, if $\mathcal{A}$ encounters a separating edge $\{a,b\}$ and there is a crossable edge $\{x,y\}$ such that x and y belong to different connected components, then the subgraph $G[a,b,x,y]$ can be embedded as a kite so that edge $\{a,b\}$ crosses $\{x,y\}$ (Lemma 7.2 of [18]). Edge $\{a,b\}$ is crossed by one of the crossable edges of $\mathcal{C}[a,b]$. The make progress step (remove a correct pizza in Definition 5.1 of [18]) removes $\{a,b\}$ or $\{x,y\}$ and marks the edges $\{a,x\}$ and $\{b,x\}$ for all vertices x with a crossable edge $\{x,y\} \in \mathcal{C}[a,b]$. Similarly, algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ proceeds for separating triples, separating quadruples, and separating triangles.

The search for maximal complete subgraphs of size five and MC_4 complete algorithm $\mathcal{A}$. However, as stated before, K_5 subgraphs have a unique 1-planar embedding which is detected at an earlier stage.

Lemma 2. *The MC_5 step of algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ is vacuous if G is a triangulated 1-planar graph.*

Proof. There are five embeddings of K_5 [29] and only the one in Fig. 2(a) is 1-planar. The embedding consist of a kite and a top vertex t (called crust in [18]). The edges incident with t can be planar or are kite-covered, whereas the outer edges of the kite are planar. Hence, there is a separating 3-cycle, triple, or triangle and $\mathcal{A}$ takes these gadgets with higher priority than MC_5.

In consequence, we must consider embeddings of K_5 only as part of a small subgraph H of size at most eight that is obtained by a partition of a separating 3- or 4-cycle. The outer edges of H are treated as planar although they may be colored black, blue or cyan. For example, suppose there is a separating triangle $C = \{a,b,c\}$ and $\{a,b\}$ is crossed by $\{x,y\}$. If edge $\{x,y\}$ is removed, then $\{a,b\}$ is colored blue and the edges $\{a,x\},\{a,y\},\{b,x\},\{b,y\}$ are colored black and are planar. If G_{in} is a small subgraph obtained from $G - C$ and x is in G_{in}, then it has a planar outer triangle with vertices a, b and x.

Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ finally applies MC_4 and checks whether the detected K_4 must be embedded as a tetrahedron or as a kite. However, at this stage of the algorithm, the embedding as a tetrahedron implies that all edges are kite-covered. A planar tetrahedron is detected in the first step since there is a separating 3-cycle and there is a separating triangle or a separating triple, otherwise. Hence, only three cases remain, as described in Section 9.1 of [18].

Lemma 3. *If MC_4 applies to algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ then the K_4 subgraph is*

1. *a completely kite-covered tetrahedron, see Fig. 6(a)*
2. *an SC-graph, see Fig. 6(b), or*
3. *a kite, see Fig. 1(b),*

and they are checked in this order.



(a) (b)

Fig. 6. A (a) completely kite-covered tetrahedron and (b) an SC-graph

A crossing edge of each of the six kites it removed to make progress if a completely kite-covered tetrahedron is detected. The *SC*-graph plays a central in the graph reduction system of Schumacher [34] and Brandenburg [11]. Here a crossing edge is removed from each of the three kites. Plain kites that are surrounded by planar subgraphs are common in IC-planar and in NIC-planar graphs, as the analysis of maximal NIC-planar graphs shows [5].

Algorithm 1: Algorithm $\mathcal{B}$

Input: A 3-connected graph G with a partial edge coloring and a boolean formula η. Initially, all edges are uncolored and $\eta = \mathsf{true}$.

Output: A planar embedding of an induced subgraph of G, an edge coloring of G, and (an extension of) η.

while *there is a* K_4 *subgraph and* $|G| \geq 9$ **do**
  if *there is a separating 3-cycle* $C = (a, b, c)$ *with* $G - C = \{G_{in}, G_{out}\}$ **then**
    extend the coloring by black edges for $\{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{c, a\}$;
    return merge$(\mathcal{B}(G_{in} + C, \eta_{in}), \mathcal{B}(G_{out} + C, \eta_{out}))$;
  else if *there is a separating edge* $\{a, b\}$ **then**
    extend the coloring by an orange edge $\{a, b\}$;
    foreach *edge* $\{x, y\} \in \mathcal{C}[a, b]$ **do**
      extend the coloring by black edges $\{a, x\}, \{x, b\}, \{b, y\}, \{a, y\}$ and a cyan edge $\{x, y\}$;
      add $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$ to η;
    return $\mathcal{B}(G - \{a, b\}, \eta)$;
  else if *there is a separating 4-cycle* $C = (a, b, c, d)$ *and* $G - C = \{G_{in}, G_{out}\}$ **then**
    extend the coloring by black edges $\{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{c, d\}, \{d, a\}$;
    if $\{a, c\} \in G_{in}$ **then** $e = \{b, d\}$ **else** $e = \{a, c\}$;
    if $\{a, c\} \in G_{out}$ **then** $f = \{b, d\}$ **else** $f = \{a, c\}$;
    return merge$(\mathcal{B}(G_{in} + C + e, \eta_{in}), \mathcal{B}(G_{out} + C + f, \eta_{out}))$;
  else if *there is a separating triple* $C = (a, b, c)$ *with* $\mathcal{C}[a, b] = \{\{u, v\}\}$ **then**
    color $\{a, b\}$ red and $\{u, v\}$ blue (or vice-versa) and let e be the red edge and $\{b, c\}, \{c, a\}, \{a, u\}, \{a, v\}, \{b, u\}, \{b, v\}$ black;
    add $\alpha(\kappa)$ to η where $\kappa = G[\{a, b, u, v\}]$;
    return $\mathcal{B}(G - e, \eta)$;
  else if *there is a separating quadruple* $C = (a, b, c, d)$ *with* $\mathcal{C}[a, b] = \{x, y\}$ **then**
    color $\{a, b\}$ red and $\{x, y\}$ blue (or vice-versa) and let e be the red edge and $\{b, c\}, \{c, d\}, \{d, a\}, \{a, x\}, \{a, y\}, \{b, x\}, \{b, y\}$ black;
    add $\alpha(\kappa)$ to η where $\kappa = G[a, b, x, y]$;
    return $\mathcal{B}(G - e, \eta)$;
  else if *there is a separating triangle* $C = (a, b, c)$ *with* $\mathcal{C}[a, b] = \{\{u, v\}\}$ *and* $\mathcal{C}[b, c] = \{\{x, y\}\}$ **then**
    color one of $\{a, b\}$ and $\{u, v\}$ and one of $\{b, c\}$ and $\{x, y\}$ red and the other ones blue and let e and f be the red edges
    and color the edges
    $\{c, a\}, \{a, u\}, \{a, v\}, \{b, u\}, \{b, v\}, \{b, x\}, \{b, y\}, \{c, x\}, \{c, y\}$ black;
    add $\alpha(\kappa_1) \wedge \alpha(\kappa_2)$ to η where $\kappa_1 = G[a, b, u, v]$ and $\kappa_2 = G[b, c, x, y]$;
    return $\mathcal{B}(G - \{e, f\}, \eta)$;
  else if *there is a* K_5 **then return** (G, false) and stop ;
  else $MC_4(G, \eta)$;
final-check(G, η);

Algorithm 2: Algorithm MC_4

Input: A 3-connected graph G with a partial edge coloring and a boolean formula η.

Output: A subgraph of G, an edge coloring, and η.

if *the detected K_4 subgraph κ is a completely kite-covered tetrahedron* **then**
  foreach *edge e of κ* **do**
    color $e = \{a, c\}$ red and the crossing edge $f = \{b, d\}$ of e blue or vice versa and extend the coloring by black edges $\{a, b\}, \{b, c\}, \{c, d\}, \{d, a\}$;
    add a clause $\alpha(\kappa)$ to η;
  collect the red edges into a set F;
  return $(G - F, \eta)$;
else if *the detected K_4 subgraph is SC* **then**
  foreach *kite κ of G with a pair of crossing edges e, f* **do**
    color e red and f blue and color the remaining edges black;
    add a clause $\alpha(\kappa)$ to η;
  collect the red edges into a set F;
  return $(G - F, \eta)$;
else
  color the crossing edges of the detected kite κ red and blue and color the other edges of κ black;
  add a clause $\alpha(\kappa)$ to η;
  return $(G - e, \eta)$ where e is the red edge;

Algorithm 3: Algorithm final-check for 1-planar Graphs

Input: A 3-connected graph G with a partial edge coloring and a boolean formula η.

Output: A planar subgraph of G with an edge coloring and η.

if *G is a triangulated planar graph* **then**
  extend the coloring by black edges;
  return (G, η);
else
  if $|G| \leq 8$ **then**
    if *G has a 1-planar embedding $\mathcal{E}(G)$ extending the partial edge coloring γ* **then**
      extend the coloring by grey edges;
      collect one edge from each pair of crossing edges of $\mathcal{E}(G)$ into F;
      return $(G - F, \eta)$;
  return (G, false) and **stop**

The subroutine *merge* reverts the partition into an inner and an outer subgraph, takes the edge coloring of the subgraphs and combines the boolean formulas by a conjunction. It ignores the chord that was added for the triangulation if there is a partition by a separating 4-cycle. If $\{x_1, y_1\}, \ldots, \{x_r, y_r\}$ are the crossable edges of a separating edge $\{a, b\}$, then $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b]) = (\alpha_{\kappa_1} \vee \ldots \vee \alpha_{\kappa_r})$ where $\kappa_i = G[a, b, x_i, y_i]$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$ is a K_4.

Algorithm final-check takes any 1-planar embedding and makes progress by removing one edge from each pair of crossing edges. Uncolored edges are colored grey although the used embedding determines pairs of crossing edges. A grey edge may be planar in one 1-planar embedding of G and crossed in another.

The correctness of algorithms $\mathcal{B}$ uses the following properties of Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$, as proved in [18].

Lemma 4. *If $\mathcal{E}(G)$ is a triangulated 1-planar embedding of G, then algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ succeeds and returns a triangulated planar spanning subgraph, an edge coloring, and a boolean formula η such that each black edge is planar in $\mathcal{E}(G)$, each red, blue, and orange edge is crossed in $\mathcal{E}(G)$, there are pairs of red and blue edges that cross, and each orange edge crosses a cyan one. Moreover, one edge from each pair of crossing edges is red, orange, or grey.*

Proof. By the assumptions, G is a triangulated 1-planar graph and algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ succeeds on G. Since $\mathcal{B}$ extends $\mathcal{A}$, it also succeeds, since MC_5 does not apply, as shown in Lemma 2. Then $\mathcal{B}$ provides the edge coloring as stated. All K_4 subgraphs are scanned and their embedding is classified as a kite, as a planar tetrahedron (after a separating 3-cycle), or as a tetrahedron with kite-covered edges. One edge of each detected kite is colored red or orange, or it is colored grey in a small subgraph.

4 Specialization to IC- and NIC-Planarity

For the test of IC- and NIC-planarity we must specialize MC_4 and final-check. A completely kite-covered K_4 is not IC-planar and the SC-graph is not NIC-planar. If such a subgraph is encountered, then the recognition algorithm for IC-planarity (NIC-planarity) fails and the modified algorithm returns false and stops.

If G is a small graph of size at most eight, then consider all IC-planar (NIC-planar) embeddings of G that extend the given partial coloring. Such graphs occur at separating 3-cycles and separating 4-cycles and have an outer cycle C whose edges are colored black, blue, or cyan. If an edge e of C is colored blue, then e is crossed by an edge f, which is colored red and is not part of the evoked input graph G. Then there are black edges in G which are part of the kite with the pair of crossing edges $\{e, f\}$. Such situations decrease the number of IC-planar (NIC-planar) embeddings of G and reduce ambiguities. An ambiguity in the embeddings is due to K_5, which may choose any edge of an outer triangle as part of its kite, as shown in Fig. 3. In the IC-planar case, we obtain the formula $(a_{\kappa_1} \wedge b_{\kappa_1}) \vee (a_{\kappa_2} \wedge c_{\kappa_2}) \vee (b_{\kappa_3} \wedge c_{\kappa_3})$, where a, b, c are the vertices of

the outer face and $\kappa_1, \kappa_2, \kappa_3$ are the three possible kites. For NIC-planarity be obtain $(e_{\kappa_1} \vee f_{\kappa_2} \vee g_{\kappa_3})$, where e, f and g are the edges of the outer face. Note that edge h between the two inner vertices is in each of the three kites, but h is ignored for the boolean formula. It is internal and its three occurrences would violate the special structure of the boolean formula η that is used for an efficient evaluation. Similarly, if G has eight vertices with vertices a, b, c, d in the outer face (ignoring the added chord) and internally two K_5 including the vertices a, b, c and b, c, d, then there are two IC-planar embeddings of G and the formula is $(a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa \wedge c_{\kappa'} \wedge d_{\kappa'}) \vee (a_\kappa \wedge c_\kappa \wedge b_{\kappa'} \wedge d_{\kappa'})$, where κ and κ' are two kites. A NIC-planar embedding uses the diagonal $\{b, c\}$ for one kite and one outer edge for the second kite so that we obtain the formula $(e_{\kappa_1} \vee f_{\kappa_2} \vee g_{\kappa_3} \vee h_{\kappa_4})$ where e, f, g, h are the edges of the outer face and $\kappa_1, \ldots, \kappa_4$ are possible kites.

The extended version of algorithm final-check in $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ ($\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$) computes all IC-planar (NIC-planar) embeddings of the small graph G of size at most eight that extend the given partial coloring. Each embedding is expressed by a boolean formula in CNF using only variables for the vertices (edges) in the outer face. These formulas are combined by a disjunction to express the set of all IC-planar (NIC-planar) embeddings.

Algorithm 4: Algorithm final-check for IC-planar and NIC-planar Graphs

Input: A 3-connected graph G with a partial edge coloring and a boolean formula η.
Output: A planar subgraph of G with an edge coloring and η.

```
1  if G is a triangulated planar graph then
2      extend the coloring by black edges;
3      return (G, η);
4  else
5      if |G| ≤ 8 then
6          if G has an IC-planar (IC-planar) embedding extending the partial edge
           coloring γ then
7              Extend the coloring by grey edges;
8              Set β = false for a boolean formula β;
9              foreach IC-planar (NIC-planar) embedding E(G) extending γ do
10                 Express the embedding by a boolean formula α using only
                   variables for the vertices (edges) in the outer face of E(G) (with
                   the added chord ignored);
11                 Add α by a disjunction to β;
12             choose any IC-planar (NIC-planar) embedding E(G) with a set F of
               crossed edges;
13             add β by a conjunction to η;
14             return (G − F, η);
15     return (G, false) and stop
```

The boolean formula η collects the clause $\alpha(\kappa)$ of all possible kites κ, but it does not express IC- and NIC-planarity and a mutual exclusion of two kites with a common vertex and edge, respectively. Therefore, we extend η to η^+, and we finally transform η^+ into η^* for an efficient evaluation.

Definition 4. *The* IC-extension *(*NIC-extension*)* η^+ *of a boolean formula* η *is obtained by adding a clause*

$$\neg x_\kappa \vee \neg x_{\kappa'}$$

if there is a vertex (edge) x *with two variables* x_κ *and* $x_{\kappa'}$ *and* $\kappa \neq \kappa'$ *in clauses of* η*.*

Let $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$ be the algorithms obtained from algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ by the versions for IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs, respectively. $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ returns false and stops if $\mathcal{B}$ encounters a separating triangle, if MC_4 encounters a completely kite-covered K_4 or an SC-graph and it uses Algorithm 4 for the final test. Accordingly, $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ returns false and stops if MC_4 encounters an SC-graph and uses Algorithm 4 for the final test.

Theorem 2. *A graph* G *is triangulated IC-planar (NIC-planar) if and only if Algorithm* $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ $(\mathcal{B}_{NIC})$ *succeeds and returns a boolean formula* η *whose IC-extension (NIC-extension)* η^+ *is satisfiable.*

Proof. By Lemma 4, if algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ $(\mathcal{B}_{NIC})$ succeeds, then G is triangulated 1-planar, since $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ $(\mathcal{B}_{NIC})$ specializes algorithm $\mathcal{B}$. Construct the embedding $\mathcal{E}(G)$ by an undo of all actions taken by $\mathcal{B}$. Then $\mathcal{E}(G)$ is a 1-planar embedding in which all black edges are planar and all red, blue, and orange edges are crossed. For every K_4 subgraph which cannot be embedded planar there is a clause expressing a crossing. Consider a valid truth assignment of η^+. If a clause of $\alpha(\kappa)$ of η resp. η^+ is satisfied by $x_\kappa =$ true, then $x_{\kappa'} =$ false for all κ' such that κ and κ' share vertex (edge) e, which implies that the 1-planar embedding $\mathcal{E}(G)$ is IC-planar (NIC-planar). Conversely, if G is triangulated IC-planar (NIC-planar), then algorithms $\mathcal{A}, \mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ $(\mathcal{B}_{NIC})$ succeed. There is an embedding $\mathcal{E}(G)$ that corresponds to the computed edge coloring. The extension η^+ of the computed boolean formula η is satisfied by a truth assignment $x_\kappa =$ true for each kite of $\mathcal{E}(G)$, since each vertex (edge) x is in at most one kite.

Algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ runs in cubic time [18], and so do $\mathcal{B}, \mathcal{B}_{IC}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$. For a cubic time recognition it remains to show that the satisfiability problem of η^+ can be solved in cubic time. This is not immediately clear, since the algorithms collect clauses for the CNF formula η. Fortunately, η and η^+ have a special structure which is used for an efficient evaluation.

4.1 Evaluate IC-planar Formulas

First, consider the IC-planar case. There is a disjunction at two places: (i) a separating edge and (ii) small graphs.

If $e = \{a, b\}$ is a separating edge with candidates $f_1, \ldots, f_r$ in $\mathcal{C}[a, b]$ for a crossing, then the formula $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$ expresses all possible kites from which one is realized. Since the vertices a and b are in the kite, $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$ can be transformed into $(a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa) \wedge ((x^1_\kappa \wedge y^1_\kappa) \vee \ldots \vee (x^r_\kappa \wedge y^r_\kappa))$ with $f_i = \{x^i, y^i\}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$ and $r > 1$.

If G is a small graph after a separating 3- or 4-cycle C, then IC-planar embeddings can be expressed by a 2SAT formula with variables for the vertices of C.

Lemma 5. *If G is an IC-planar graph without a separating edge, then the IC-extension η^+ of the formula η computed by algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ is equivalent to a 2SAT formula.*

Proof. The boolean formula of a kite $\kappa = G[a, b, c, d]$ is $\alpha(\kappa) = (a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa \wedge c_\kappa \wedge d_\kappa)$ and $\alpha(\kappa)$ is added to η at a separating triple, a separating quadruple, and at a kite in MC_4. Two subexpressions are combined by a conjunction at a separating 3- and 4-cycle.

It thus remains to show that the IC-extension of a formula η for a small graph H is equivalent to a 2SAT formula, and is replaced by the 2SAT formula for further computations. Graph H is obtained by a separating 3- or 4-cycle. Then the edges of the cycle are black, blue or cyan and are treated as planar. Since blue or cyan imposes further restrictions we suppose they are black. First, suppose there is a 3-cycle with vertices a, b, c. If there is a planar embedding, then true is returned. Otherwise, if every embedding of G contains a kite, then $\eta = (a_{\kappa_1} \wedge b_{\kappa_1}) \vee (a_{\kappa_2} \wedge c_{\kappa_2}) \vee (b_{\kappa_3} \wedge c_{\kappa_3})$ is returned if H is K_5, see Fig. 3. The IC-extension adds the clauses $(\neg a_{\kappa_1} \vee \neg a_{\kappa_2}), (\neg b_{\kappa_1} \vee \neg b_{\kappa_3})$ and $(\neg c_{\kappa_2} \vee \neg c_{\kappa_3})$. The combined subexpression is equivalent to the 2SAT formula $(a_\kappa \vee b_\kappa) \wedge (a_\kappa \vee c_\kappa) \wedge (b_\kappa \vee c_\kappa)$ for a new virtual kite κ and is replaced by this formula. If G has 6, 7 or 8 vertices, then η is a 2SAT formula, since a single kite contains at most two of the outer vertices or there are two kites and 8 vertices and the formula is equivalent to $(a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa \wedge c_\kappa)$. Similarly, if H is obtained by a separating 4-cycle $C = (a, b, c, d)$, then there is a K_5 with three outer vertices a, b, c as above, or η is a 2SAT formula. In particular, if H contains two K_5 with vertices a, b, c, u, v and a, c, d, x, y, then $\eta = (a_{\kappa_1} \wedge b_{\kappa_1}) \wedge (c_{\kappa_2} \wedge d_{\kappa_2}) \vee (a_{\kappa_3} \wedge c_{\kappa_3}) \wedge (b_{\kappa_4} \wedge d_{\kappa_4})$, which after the IC-extension is equivalent to $(a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa \wedge c_\kappa \wedge d_\kappa)$.

The satisfiability problem for η^+ can be reduced to a series of 2SAT satisfiability problems, which altogether can be solved in linear time in the length of η^+. This technique was used in [13].

Lemma 6. *There is a linear time algorithm (in the length of η^+) to test the satisfiability of the IC-extension η^+ of a triangulated IC-planar graph.*

Proof. Consider the recursive construction of the boolean formula η by algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$. All subexpressions are in 2SAT form or are replaced by an equivalent 2SAT formula as shown in Lemma 5, except if there is a separating edge. We proceed by induction on the depth of the formula. Consider the first separating edge

$\{a, b\}$ and the computed formula $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$. As stated before, $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$ can be transformed into $(a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa) \wedge ((x^1_\kappa \wedge y^1_\kappa) \vee \ldots, \vee (x^r_\kappa \wedge y^r_\kappa))$ with $f_i = \{x^i, y^i\}$ for $i = 1, \ldots, r$ and $\mathcal{C}[a, b]) = (f_1, \ldots, f_r)$ in this order according to the rotation system at a. Then a, b, x_1, y_r are the outer vertices, and $x_2, \ldots, x_r, y_1, \ldots, y_{r-1}$ are inner vertices. We wish to use a pair of inner vertices (together with a and b) for the kite. For $i = 2, \ldots, r-1$ check the satisfiability of the subexpression $\eta^+(a, x_i, b, y_i)$ of η^+ that corresponds to the subgraph H of G that is separated by the 4-cycle $C = (a, x_i, b, y_i)$. Since H has no separating edge, $\eta^+(a, x_i, b, y_i)$ is equivalent to a 2SAT formula, whose satisfiability is checked in linear time. If $\eta^+(a, x_i, b, y_i)$ is satisfiable for some i, then replace $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$ by $(a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa)$. Otherwise, check the satisfiability of $\eta^+(a, x_1, b, y_1)$ and of $\eta^+(a, x_r, b, y_r)$. If neither of them is satisfiable, then η^+ is not satisfiable and the given graph G is not IC-planar. If only one is satisfiable, say $\eta^+(a, x^1, b, y^1)$, then replace $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$ by $(a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa \wedge x^1_\kappa)$, and replace $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$ by $(a_\kappa \wedge b_\kappa) \wedge (x^1_\kappa \vee x^r_\kappa)$. Each subexpression $\eta^+(a, x_i, b, y_i)$ is evaluated at most once, namely for the satisfiability check of $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$, and $\sigma(a, b, \mathcal{C}[a, b])$ is replaced by a short formula in the further computation of the satisfiability check of η^+.

A 1-planar graph of size n has at most $n-2$ kites, and the bound is achieved by optimal 1-planar graphs with $4n-8$ edges [8,34]. Hence, the boolean formula η has length $O(n)$. However, the IC-extension may add up to $O(n^2)$ subexpressions of the form $(\neg x_\kappa \vee \neg x_{\kappa'})$, for example, if x is the center of a star of K_5, as illustrated in Fig. 7.



Fig. 7. A graph with many K_5 subgraphs inducing many IC-extensions

In consequence, the satisfiability check of η^+ takes linear time in the length of the formula and at most quadratic time in the size of the input graph. This is less than the cubic running time of algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$.

In summary, we obtain:

Theorem 3. *Triangulated IC-planar graphs can be recognized in cubic time.*

4.2 Evaluate NIC-planar formulas

Algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$ extends algorithm $\mathcal{B}$ and stops with a failure if MC_4 detects an SC-graph. In addition, it computes all NIC-planar embeddings of small graphs

and expresses them by a boolean formula η. A boolean variable has the form e_κ for some edge e and a kite κ containing e as a planar edge. If G is a small graph that results from a separating 3- or 4-cycle C, then only the edges of C are taken into account. An inner edge of a K_5 occurs in three kites and does not satisfy the next lemma.

Lemma 7. *For every edge e with an occurrence of a variable e_κ in η there are at most two variables e_κ and $e_{\kappa'}$ in η.*

Proof. First, observe that each variable e_κ occurs once in η since algorithms $\mathcal{A}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$ check each K_4 exactly once and $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$ introduces a boolean variable e_κ if edge e is a planar edge of candidate kite κ, which is a unique event.

Second, all steps of algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$ introduce at most two variables e_κ and $e_{\kappa'}$ for two candidate kites κ and κ', except if G is a small graph of size at most eight. Let C be the edges of the outer cycle of G. Then C is a 3-cycle or a 4-cycle and G and C are obtained from the separating 3-cycle and 4-cycle steps of the algorithm, except if the input graph is small, which is checked by exhaustive search. Suppose that the edges of C are colored black. Otherwise, the possible NIC-planar embeddings of G are more restricted.

Assume that G must be embedded with at least one kite. First, suppose that C is a 3-cycle with edges e^1, e^2 and e^3. If $G = K_5$, then exactly one edge e of C is part of a kite, as illustrated in Fig. 3, and all NIC-planar embeddings are expressed by the boolean formula $\alpha = e^1_{\kappa_1} \vee e^2_{\kappa_2} \vee e^3_{\kappa_3}$. A graph G of size six with outer cycle C is NIC-planar if there is a fixed kite including one edge of C or there is a K_5 with one of two edges of C. Hence, $\alpha = e_\kappa$ or $\alpha = e_\kappa \vee e'_{\kappa'}$ for edges $e, e' \in \{e^1, e^2, e^3\}$. If G has size seven, then a NIC-planar embedding has up to two kites. At least one kite is fixed and the other is part of a K_5, see Fig. 8. The possible NIC-planar embeddings are expressed by $\alpha = e(\kappa) \wedge e'(\kappa')$ if both K_4 are fixed and by $\alpha = e_1(\kappa_1) \wedge (e_2(\kappa_2) \vee e_3(\kappa_3))$, otherwise. Similarly, if there is only one kite that needs an edge of C, then $\alpha = e(\kappa)$ or $\alpha = e(\kappa) \vee e'(\kappa')$ express these embeddings. Finally, if G has size eight, then it has up to two fixed K_4 or two outer edges may belong to a K_5 and the other edge to a fixed K_4 such that $\alpha = e^1(\kappa_1) \wedge e^2(\kappa_2)$ or $\alpha = e^1(\kappa_1) \wedge (e^2(\kappa_2) \vee e^3(\kappa_3))$ or α is a subexpression thereof.

Similarly, if C is a 4-cycle with edges e^1, e^2, e^3, e^4, then a graph of size eight can host two K_5 and at most two kites. Each K_5 indices a kite and one of the two K_5 shall form a kite using only inner edges including the diagonal, see Fig. 9. These NIC-planar embeddings are expressed by $\alpha = (e^1(\kappa_1) \vee e^2(\kappa_2) \vee e^3(\kappa_3) \vee e^4(\kappa_4))$. Clearly both K_4 can be fixed using up to three edges of C. Each option is expressed by a boolean formula that uses a variable e_κ for each edge e of C at most once.

Lemma 8. *The satisfiability of η^+ can be checked in linear time.*

Proof. Consider the formulas η and η^+ that are obtained by algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$ and the NIC-extension.

(a) (b)

Fig. 8. NIC-planar embeddings of a small graph with 7 vertices

(a) (b)

Fig. 9. NIC-planar embeddings of a small graph with 8 vertices, a planar 4-cycle and two inner K_5

Set a variable $e(\kappa) = \mathsf{true}$ if there is a single variable $e(\kappa)$ for some edge e in η. Then there is no NIC-extension. Simplify η and η^+ accordingly. Otherwise, there are two variables $e(\kappa)$ and $e(\kappa')$ with $\kappa \neq \kappa'$ in η and there is the NIC-extension $\neg e(\kappa) \vee \neg e(\kappa')$. Keep the first occurrence $e(\kappa)$ in η and replace the second occurrence $e(\kappa')$ by $\neg e(\kappa)$ and omit the NIC-extensions. Since each edge e occurs in two variables $e(\kappa)$ and $e(\kappa')$, this transformation preserves the equivalence of the boolean formulas. Let η^* denote the resulting formula. Then η^* is satisfiable if and only if there is no complementary pair $(x, \neg x)$ in some clause, which can be checked in linear time. Each simplification of η can be done in constant time. Hence, the satisfiability test of η, η^+ and η^* takes linear time.

As before, there are at most $O(n)$ kites such that the length of η is linear in the size of the given graph G. Each edge e belongs to at most two kites. Thus, the NIC-extensions adds at most $O(n)$ 2SAT clauses. By Lemma 8 the satisfiability check of η^+ takes linear time in the size of the graph. This is dominated by the running time of algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{NIC}$, and we can conclude:

Theorem 4. *Triangulated NIC-planar graphs can be recognized in cubic time.*

4.3 Embeddings

We can generalize Thms. 3 and 4 to graphs G whose 3-connected components are triangulated IC-planar and NIC-planar. Consider a separation pair $\{u, v\}$ of G and components $H_1, \ldots, H_r$ for some $r > 1$ which each contain the vertices u

and v and the edge $e = \{u, v\}$. Then G is IC-planar if and only if each H_i for $i = 1, \ldots, r$ is IC-planar and each of u and v occurs in at most one kite. This is checked as follows: Let algorithm $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ return the boolean formula η_i on H_i. If η_i has a variable $x(\kappa)$ for $x \in \{u, v\}$ and some kite κ, then set $x(\kappa) = \mathsf{false}$. If thereafter the IC-extension η_i^+ is not satisfiable, then vertex x is needed in H_i. Graph G is not IC-planar if there are at least two such H_i. Accordingly, if v is an articulation vertex with components $J_1, \ldots, J_s$ for some $s > 1$, then check each component $J_i + v$ and check that v is in a kite of at most one component. Clearly, a graph is IC-planar if so are its disconnected components.

Similarly, G is NIC-planar if and only if each 2-connected component H_i is NIC-planar and edge e occurs in at most one kite, which is checked as before.

Note that the decomposition of a graph at its separation pairs corresponds to the introduction of holes in maps [10]. We can summarize:

Theorem 5. *There is a cubic-time algorithm to test whether a graph is IC-planar (NIC-planar) if each 3-connected component is triangulated 1-planar.*

The algorithms $\mathcal{B}$, $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ and $\mathcal{B}_{IC}$ color the edges of a triangulated 1-planar graph such that black edges are always embedded planar, red, blue and orange edges are crossing edges, and the status of cyan and grey edges is open. Nevertheless, the algorithms cannot determine an embedding. There are triangulated IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs with exponentially many embeddings, as illustrated in Figs. 10 and 11. These graphs are maximal in their class. If $\mathcal{B}$ is applied to these graphs, it finds separating 3-cycles and many small graphs with a K_5, which each allow for at least two embeddings.



Fig. 10. An IC-planar graph with many embeddings. Each 5-wheel with an open inner vertex can be flipped, which implies a change of planar and crossing edges in the adjacent kites. Such flips do not change the picture.

4.4 Maximal Graphs

Obviously, we can test maximality by exhaustive search on graphs $G + e$, such that G is 1-planar and $G+e$ is not. In the planar-maximal case, edge e is colored black, and therefore must be embedded planar.

Theorem 6. *For a graph G it takes $\mathcal{O}(n^5)$ time to test whether G is planar-maximal and maximal 1-planar, IC-planar, and NIC-planar, respectively.*



Fig. 11. A (maximal) NIC-planar graph G with many embeddings, which are due to the separating 3-cycles. Each 5-wheel with an open inner vertex can be flipped, which implies a change of planar and crossing edges in the adjacent kites. Such flips do not change the picture.

There are special linear time algorithm for optimal 1-planar graphs [12] and for NIC-planar graphs [5] which use the particular structure of optimal graphs. Recall that there are optimal IC-planar (NIC-planar) graphs only for values $n = 4k + 4$ ($n = 5k + 2$) and $k \geq 1$.

Theorem 7. *For a graph G it takes $\mathcal{O}(n^3)$ time to test whether G is maximum (optimal) IC-planar (NIC-planar).*

Proof. A graph G is maximum (or densest) IC-planar if G has $\lfloor 3.25\, n - 6 \rfloor$ edges and is triangulated IC-planar. Similarly, test whether G is triangulated NIC-planar and has the maximum number of edges of edges of NIC-planar graphs of size b, which is $d(n) = \lfloor 3.6\,(n-2) \rfloor - \epsilon$ where $\epsilon = 0, 1$ and $\epsilon = 0$ for $n = 5k + i$ and $i = 2, 3$ and $k \geq 2$. The value of *epsion* for all n is not yet known.

4.5 NP-Completeness

Finally, we improve upon the NP-hardness proofs of 1-planarity. We prove that for every instance α of planar 3-SAT there is a graph G_α such that G_α is IC planar if α is satisfiable and α is satisfiable if G_α is 1-planar, even if G_α is 3-connected and is given with a rotation system. In consequence, we obtain:

Theorem 8. *For a graph G it is NP-complete to test whether G is IC-planar (NIC planar), even if G is 3-connected and is given with (or without) a rotation system.*

Proof. We combine and generalize the NP-hardness results of Auer et al. [4] on 3-connected 1-planar graphs and of Brandenburg et al. [13]. Both approaches reduce from planar 3-SAT [30] and use gadgets with a unique embedding and the membrane technique.

We replace the U-graphs from [4] by M^+-graphs which are modified grid graphs with a sequence of free connection vertices in the outer face, and are drawn as circles in Fig. 12. Our M^+-graphs extend the M-graphs of [13] by further edges which yield a triangulation except for the side with the connection vertices. Obviously, M^+-graphs are IC-planar, and even more, M^+-graphs have a unique 1-planar embedding if the connection vertices are in the outer face. The

uniqueness is obtained by using Algorithms $\mathcal{A}$ or $\mathcal{B}$ on an extension of an M^+-graph to a triangulated graph N which has a new vertex z in the outer face so that z is connected with each connection vertex. Only MC_4 with a kite applies to N. Hence, N has a unique 1-planar embedding. Now we can use the gadgets from the NP-hardness proof of [13] with M^+ graphs instead of M-graphs. For every planar 3-SAT instance α construct a graph G_α. Then G_α is 3-connected IC-planar if the instance of planar 3-SAT is satisfiable. The rotation system can directly be derived from the embedding, and it is unique. Conversely, if G_α is 1-planar, then it is IC-planar and α is satisfiable.



Fig. 12. The structure of an M^+ graph.

5 Conclusion

We have shown that triangulated, (planar) maximal, maximum and optimal IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs can be recognized in at most $O(n^5)$ time. Similar bounds are known for 1-planar graphs. On the other hand, the recognition problem remains NP-hard if the graphs are 3-connected. However, the complexity of the recognition problem for 4- and 5-connected IC-planar and NIC-planar graphs remains open.

References

1. Alam, M.J., Brandenburg, F.J., Kobourov, S.G.: Straight-line drawings of 3-connected 1-planar graphs. In: Wismath, S., Wolff, A. (eds.) GD 2013. LNCS, vol. 8242, pp. 83–94. Springer (2013)
2. Albertson, M.: Chromatic number, independence ratio, and crossing number. Ars Math. Contemp. 1(1), 1–6 (2008)
3. Auer, C., Bachmaier, C., Brandenburg, F.J., Gleißner, A., Hanauer, K., Neuwirth, D., Reislhuber, J.: Outer 1-planar graphs. Algorithmica 74(4), 1293–1320 (2016)
4. Auer, C., Brandenburg, F.J., Gleißner, A., Reislhuber, J.: 1-planarity of graphs with a rotation system. J. Graph Algorithms Appl. 19(1), 67–86 (2015)

5. Bachmaier, C., Brandenburg, F.J., Hanauer, K., Neuwirth, D., Reislhuber, J.: NIC-planar graphs. CoRR abs/1602. (2016)
6. Bannister, M.J., Cabello, S., Eppstein, D.: Parameterized complexity of 1-planarity. In: WADS 2013. LNCS, vol. 8037, pp. 97–108. Springer (2013)
7. Bodendiek, R., Schumacher, H., Wagner, K.: Bemerkungen zu einem Sechsfarbenproblem von G. Ringel. Abh. aus dem Math. Seminar der Univ. Hamburg 53, 41–52 (1983)
8. Bodendiek, R., Schumacher, H., Wagner, K.: Über 1-optimale Graphen. Mathematische Nachrichten 117, 323–339 (1984)
9. Brandenburg, F.J.: 1-visibility representation of 1-planar graphs. J. Graph Algorithms Appl. 18(3), 421–438 (2014)
10. Brandenburg, F.J.: On 4-map graphs and 1-planar graphs and their recognition problem. CoRR abs/1509.03447 (2015), http://arxiv.org/abs/1509.03447
11. Brandenburg, F.J.: Recognizing optimal 1-planar graphs in linear time. Algorithmica (published on-line Oct 13, 2016) (2016)
12. Brandenburg, F.J.: A reduction system for optimal 1-planar graphs. CoRR abs/1602.06407 (2016)
13. Brandenburg, F.J., Didimo, W., Evans, W.S., Kindermann, P., Liotta, G., Montecchianti, F.: Recognizing and drawing IC-planar graphs. Theor. Comput. Sci. 636, 1–16 (2016)
14. Brandenburg, F.J., Eppstein, D., Gleißner, A., Goodrich, M.T., Hanauer, K., Reislhuber, J.: On the density of maximal 1-planar graphs. In: van Kreveld, M., Speckmann, B. (eds.) GD 2012. LNCS, vol. 7704, pp. 327–338. Springer (2013)
15. Cabello, S., Mohar, B.: Adding one edge to planar graphs makes crossing number and 1-planarity hard. SIAM J. Comput. 42(5), 1803–1829 (2013)
16. Chen, Z., Grigni, M., Papadimitriou, C.H.: Planar map graphs. In: Proc. 30th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing. pp. 514–523 (1998)
17. Chen, Z., Grigni, M., Papadimitriou, C.H.: Map graphs. J. ACM 49(2), 127–138 (2002)
18. Chen, Z., Grigni, M., Papadimitriou, C.H.: Recognizing hole-free 4-map graphs in cubic time. Algorithmica 45(2), 227–262 (2006)
19. Di Battista, G., Eades, P., Tamassia, R., Tollis, I.G.: Graph Drawing: Algorithms for the Visualization of Graphs. Prentice Hall (1999)
20. Diestel, R.: Graph Theory. Springer (2000)
21. Eades, P., Liotta, G.: Right angle crossing graphs and 1-planarity. Discrete Applied Mathematics 161(7-8), 961–969 (2013)
22. Eggleton, R.B.: Rectilinear drawings of graphs. Utilitas Math. 29, 149–172 (1986)
23. de Fraysseix, H., Pach, J., Pollack, R.: How to draw a planar graph on a grid. Combinatorica 10, 41–51 (1990)
24. Grigoriev, A., Bodlaender, H.L.: Algorithms for graphs embeddable with few crossings per edge. Algorithmica 49(1), 1–11 (2007)
25. Hong, S., Eades, P., Katoh, N., Liotta, G., Schweitzer, P., Suzuki, Y.: A linear-time algorithm for testing outer-1-planarity. Algorithmica 72(4), 1033–1054 (2015)
26. Kaufmann, M., Wagner, D.: Drawing Graphs, LNCS, vol. 2025. Springer (2001)
27. Korzhik, V.P., Mohar, B.: Minimal obstructions for 1-immersion and hardness of 1-planarity testing. J. Graph Theor. 72, 30–71 (2013)
28. Král, D., Stacho, L.: Coloring plane graphs with independent crossings. Journal of Graph Theory 64(3), 184–205 (2010)
29. Kyncl, J.: Enumeration of simple complete topological graphs. Eur. J. Comb. 30(7), 1676–1685 (2009)

30. Lichtenstein, D.: Planar formulae and their uses. SIAM J. Comput. 11(2), 329–343 (1982)
31. Liotta, G.: Graph drawing beyond planarity: some results and open problems. In: Bistarelli, S., Formisano, A. (eds.) Proc. 15th Italian Conference on Theoretical Computer Science. CEUR Workshop Proceedings, vol. 1231, pp. 3–8. CEUR-WS.org (2014)
32. Ringel, G.: Ein Sechsfarbenproblem auf der Kugel. Abh. aus dem Math. Seminar der Univ. Hamburg 29, 107–117 (1965)
33. Schnyder, W.: Embedding planar graphs on the grid. In: ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms, SODA 1990. pp. 138–147. SIAM (1990)
34. Schumacher, H.: Zur Struktur 1-planarer Graphen. Mathematische Nachrichten 125, 291–300 (1986)
35. Tamassia, R. (ed.): Handbook of Graph Drawing and Visualization. CRC Press (2013)
36. Thomassen, C.: Rectilinear drawings of graphs. J. Graph Theor. 12(3), 335–341 (1988)
37. Thorup, M.: Map graphs in polynomial time. In: Proc. 39th FOCS. pp. 396–405. IEEE Computer Society (1998)
38. Zhang, X., Liu, G.: The structure of plane graphs with independent crossings and its application to coloring problems. Central Europ. J. Math 11(2), 308–321 (2013)
39. Zhang, X.: Drawing complete multipartite graphs on the plane with restrictions on crossings. Acta Math. Sinica, English Series 30(12), 2045–2053 (2014)